

REMARKS

Applicant has amended claims 1, 6-7, 9 and 10 for the purposes of overcoming the rejections relating thereto, more appropriately expressing the subject matter, and in respect of informalities. No new matter is added by these amendments. Claims 1-10 remain pending in the present application. Applicant highly appreciates Examiner's careful review of the present application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wong et al. (US 6,115,690, hereinafter "Wong").

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and removal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. 103 over Wong. The following remarks herein are responsive to the rejections as understood.

Claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

'a procurement data managing module for managing procurement data obtained from the external systems, [and]

a payment date and sum calculating module for calculating optimal payment sums and dates according to the payment term data obtained by the data obtaining module'.

Applicant submits that Wong does not disclose, teach or suggest the invention having the above-highlighted features as set forth in claim 1, as amended.

Wong discloses that intelligent catalog management, in an exemplary embodiment, is based on a concept of "baseline" (col. 19, lines 16-17). A baseline is a collection of products that functions as a standard of comparison (col. 19, lines 17-19).

According to these disclosures of Wong, a catalog is to be managed according to a collection of products (indicated by Examiner to represent procurement data). However, the presently claimed "procurement data managing module" in claim 1 *can manage procurement data obtained from the external systems*. It is the procurement data that is

managed. Applicant does not claim that the procurement data function as a standard of comparison in managing something else. The procurement data managing module feature is sourced from at least paragraph [0019] of the originally filed specification, and is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Wong. Wong's collection of products (indicated by Examiner to represent procurement data) is used as a standard of comparison to manage a catalog. That is, Wong's collection of products is merely a management tool used for managing target data in the form of the catalog. In contrast, the present procurement data are themselves the target data that are managed. Also, Wong's managed catalog cannot properly be equated with the present managed procurement data. Accordingly, applicant submits that Wong fails to disclose, teach or suggest the feature of **"a procurement data managing module for managing procurement data obtained from the external systems"**, as recited in amended claim 1 of the present application.

In addition, on page 4 of the Office action, it was indicated that Figures 93A-93C of Wong display the item "Total Invoice" as a payment sum, the item "Amount for each Invoice" as payment terms, and that an optimal payment is construed as a payment schedule with the item "Billed Amount" and the item "Due Date". Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses as follows. Figures 93A-93C include a payment list with a plurality of items such as "Payee", "Vendor", "Invoice", "Billed Amnt (Billed Amount)", "Due Date", "Amount (Amount for each Invoice)", and "Total Invoice". Applicant submits that the item "Billed Amount" and the item "Due Date" denote two different items of said "baseline", and the item "Billed Amount" and the item "Due Date" must be satisfied if a payment corresponding to the payment list is accepted. In contrast, the presently claimed "payment date and sum calculating module" of amended claim 1 can *calculate optimal payment sums and dates* according to payment term data. This feature is sourced from paragraphs [0023] and [0028] of the originally filed specification, and is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Wong. It is apparent that Wong only discloses final requirements of a payment, but does not disclose or teach the claimed *"optimal payment sums and dates"* that have been *calculated according to*

payment term data, as recited in amended claim 1. Accordingly, applicant submits that Wong fails to disclose, teach or suggest the feature of **“a payment date and sum calculating module for calculating optimal payment sums and dates according to the payment term data** obtained by the data obtaining module”, as recited in amended claim 1 of the present application.

For at least the above reasons, applicant asserts that the present system for managing accounts payable is distinctly and patentably different from the integrated business-to-business Web commerce and business automation system disclosed by Wong.

In conclusion, applicant submits that Wong does not disclose, teach, or even suggest the present invention having the above-highlighted features as set forth in amended claim 1. That is, amended claim 1 is not only novel under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Wong, but also unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Wong. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of amended claim 1 are requested.

Since claims 2-5 depend from amended independent claim 1, and respectively recite additional subject matter, claims 2-5 should also now be allowable.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong in view of Lee et al. (US 2003/0040990, hereinafter “Lee”).

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and removal of the rejections and allowance of claims 6-10. The following remarks herein are responsive to the rejections as understood.

With regard to claims 6-9:

Claim 6, as amended, recites in part:

“determining whether the procurement has an advance payment;

deducting a sum of the advance payment from the at least one account payable if the procurement has an advance payment;
determining whether the procurement has a purchase discount; [and]
deducting a sum of the purchase discount from the at least one account payable if the procurement has a purchase discount”.

Applicant submits that Wong and Lee, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or otherwise suggest the above-highlighted limitations as set forth in claim 6 as amended.

Lee teaches a method to automatically calculate a cash discount for early payment (paragraph [0017]). A method utilizes a computer system. The computer system generates a payment batch number corresponding to all payable documents, and inputs current intended settlement amount(s) corresponding to any of the payable documents and current deductible amount(s) (paragraph [0035]). The computer system also provides cash discount amount(s) to enable users to decide whether to make an early payment (paragraph [0039]). Users enter a current settlement amount through the computer system to automatically calculate a cash discount (paragraph [0047]).

According to these disclosures of Lee, a cash discount amount (indicated by Examiner to represent a sum of the purchase discount) can be calculated by utilizing the current settlement amount entered in the system, and can be used to enable users to decide whether or not to make an early payment (indicated by Examiner to represent **an advance payment**). However, the presently claimed “**the at least one account payable**” in claim 6 is not disclosed or suggested by Lee. In particular, there is no teaching or suggestion in the system of Lee in relation to the feature of “**deducting a sum of the advance payment from the at least one account payable**”, and the feature of “**deducting a sum of the purchase discount from the at least one account payable**”, as recited in claim 6 of the present application. As asserted above, Lee only discloses that the current settlement amount and the current deductible amount can be inputted, and that the early payment (indicated by Examiner to represent **the advance payment**) can be decided according to the cash discount amount (**the sum of the**

purchase discount) calculated by utilizing the current settlement amount inputted to the system.

Accordingly, Lee fails to teach or suggest the features of **“determining whether the procurement has an advance payment; [and] deducting a sum of the advance payment from the at least one account payable if the procurement has an advance payment”**, and further fails to teach or suggest the features of **“determining whether the procurement has a purchase discount; [and] deducting a sum of the purchase discount from the at least one account payable if the procurement has a purchase discount”**, as recited in amended claim 6 of the present application.

In addition, as stated by Examiner on page 7 of the Office action, Wong does not teach or suggest the above-highlighted features. Therefore, any combination of Wong and Lee does not teach or suggest the above-highlighted features either.

For at least the above reasons, amended claim 6 is unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Wong in view of Lee. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of the claim are requested.

Since claims 7-9 depend from amended independent claim 6, and respectively recite additional subject matter, claims 7-9 should also now be allowable.

With regard to claim 10:

Claim 10, as amended, recites in part:

**“means for determining whether a related advance payment has been made and deducting a sum of said advance payment from the at least one account payable if applicable; [and]
means for determining whether a related purchase discount exists and deducting a sum of said purchase discount from the at least one account payable if applicable”.**

Claim 10 is a system claim corresponding to the method of claim 6. Referring to and incorporating herein the above-asserted reasons regarding the patentability of amended claim 6, applicant submits that for similar reasons, Wong and Lee, taken alone

or in combination, do not teach or otherwise suggest the method having the above-highlighted features as set forth in amended claim 10. Therefore, amended claim 10 is unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Wong in view of Lee. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of the claim are requested.

In view of the above claim amendments and remarks, the subject application is believed to be in a condition for allowance, and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that the foregoing Amendment and Response place this application in condition for allowance. If Examiner believes that there are any issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference, or that there are any informalities that can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, please call the undersigned at 714.626.1224.

Respectfully,

Juei-Mei Wang

By / Frank R. Niranjani / Feb. 27, 2008

Frank R. Niranjani

Registration No.: 41,572

Please recognize the application with Customer No. 25,859

Foxconn International, Inc.

P.O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive, Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel No.: (714) 626-1224

Fax No.: (714) 738-4649